

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

By this amendment, the specification has been amended to insert “Cross-Reference to Related Applications” which contains information reflected on the filing receipt.

Further by this amendment, claims 7-9 have been amended. Support for the amended claims can be found, for example, at least by paragraph [0068] of the specification. Accordingly, it is submitted that no new matter has been added. Claims 5 and 15-17 have been withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 6-14 are currently pending in this application.

The Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by Examiner Helen Shibru for conducting a personal interview with the Applicants representative on January 22, 2010 at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. During the interview, a proposed amendment and arguments distinguishing independent claims 1 and 7 as contained in the proposed amendment were presented. The Examiner acknowledged the distinctions presented over the prior art and indicated, as reflected on the Interview Summary form, that an updated search would be performed. Accordingly, by this amendment, the claims have been amended in the same manner as presented during the personal interview. Included next is a Statement of the Substance of the Interview.

Independent claims 1 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murase (USPN: 5,907,658) for the reasons contained in paragraph 5 of the Office action.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the aforementioned rejection and submit the Murase reference fails to teach each and every feature recited in independent claims 1 and 7 of the present application.

Independent claim 1 of the present application in part recites a recording medium having recorded thereon a video stream and a graphics stream, wherein the graphics stream includes a plurality of Display Sets that constitute respective menu presentations (e.g., Display sets 0, 1 and 2 shown in Figs. 17 & 19), each menu presentation being composed of one or more pages, and each Display Set including version information that shows whether or not content of each of the pages in the Display Sets has changed with respect to a previous Display Set (e.g., version 0, version 1 and version 2 shown in Figure 19).

As noted in paragraph 5 of the Office action, the Examiner has interpreted the video object units of Murase (i.e., VOB #101 and VOB #125 shown in Figs. 19A and 19B, respectively) for teaching the Display Sets recited in claim 1. It is noted that Figs. 19A and 19B depict video pack 201 and sub-picture pack A-101 included in VOB #101 and video pack 250 and sub-picture pack A-125 included in VOB #125, respectively.

Next, as noted in paragraph 5 of the Office action, the Examiner has interpreted the item information and highlight information in the management information pack of the Murase reference (i.e., 'YES', 'NO', (X1, Y1), (X2, Y2) shown in Figs. 19A, 19B and 20) for teaching the contents of the menu in the Display Set recited in claim 1.

Finally, the Examiner has relied upon the description of column 25 (lines 7-31) of Murase for teaching the feature of each Display Set including version information that shows whether or not content of each of the pages in the Display Set has changed with respect to a previous Display Set. However, assuming arguendo that the above-mentioned interpretations of

the Murase reference by the Examiner are correct, then it would also be necessary for the Murase reference to disclose information indicating, for each video object unit, how the item information and highlight information that define the menu in Figure 19A changes with respect to the item information and highlight information that define the menu in Figure 19B. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the Murase reference clearly does not provide such a teaching for at least the reasons provided next.

Particularly, the Murase reference discloses that a value stored in a general purpose register changes according to a confirmed selection on menus displayed by a sub-picture pack in each video object unit. Viewing Figure 20, when a selection is confirmed using "Yes" item (i.e., when "Yes" is selected twice) in a menu of the sub-picture pack A-101 in the 101th VOB and in a menu of the sub-picture pack A-125 in the 125th VOB, because the register command "SetReg R1, 1" is executed twice, the value stored in the general purpose register is "2" [see column 25 (lines 7-10)]. Next, suppose that the reproduction of a series of images as shown in Fig. 18 is completed after these substitutions of the general purpose register and the reproduction control changes from the GOP level shown in Figs. 19A and 19B to the route level with the PGC information shown in Fig. 17. As a result, because the value stored in the general purpose register R1 is "2", the command "CmpRegLink R1, 2, =, PGC#5" in the post-processing command field is executed and the disk reproduction apparatus judges that general-purpose register R1 has "2" and the reproduction control branches to program chain #5 because the value stored in the general purpose register matches "2" [see column 25 (lines 10-18)].

Accordingly, while column 25 (lines 7-31) of the Murase reference discloses a general purpose register having a value which changes according to a selection confirmed on menus of two video objects, such portion of the Murase reference does not disclose information indicating,

for each video object unit, how the item information and highlight information that define the menu in Figure 19A changes with respect to the item information and highlight information that define the menu in Figure 19B. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Murase reference does not disclose version information that shows whether or not content of each of the pages in the Display Set has changed with respect to a previous Display set, as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

Independent claim 7 directed towards a playback apparatus, while not identical to independent claim 1 directed towards a recording medium, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to independent claim 1. Particularly, for the same reasons mentioned, above, it is submitted that the Murase reference fails to disclose a playback apparatus comprising a write control unit operable to, when a new Display Set is read in accordance with progression of playback of the video stream and when a page version number included in, among a plurality of pieces of page information included in the new Display Set, a piece of page information corresponding to a currently displayed page is incremented more than a page version number of the currently displayed page, use the pieces of page information included in the new Display Set to update contents of a graphics plane, as recited in independent claim 7. Accordingly, independent claim 7 is likewise allowable over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that each of independent claims 1 and 7, as well as claims 2-4, 6 and 8-14 dependent therefrom, is clearly allowable and the Examiner is kindly requested to promptly pass this case to issuance.

In the event, however, that the Examiner has any comments or suggestion of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the Applicant's representatives to expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dhiren Odedra, Reg. #41,227/

Dhiren Odedra
Reg. No. 41,227

January 26, 2010

Panasonic Patent Center
1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: 202-912-3800
Fax: 202-912-0774

Customer No. 42212